

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/436,656	11/09/1999	KENJI TAGAWA	00177/530318	6961
7590 07/28/2004			EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH LIND & PONACK			O CONNOR, GERALD J	
2033 "K" STREET N W SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/436,656 Tagawa et al.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	O'Connor	3627	MW
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence	address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a sy within the statutory minimum of thin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered to NTHS from the mailing date of the BANDONED (35 U.S.C. 8 133).	imely.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>June</u>	_2, 2004 and April 22, 200	04.	
	action is non-final.	<del></del>	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to	the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>22-24 and 26-28</u> is/are pending in the	application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>none</u> is/are withdra	* •		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) 22-24 and 26-28 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers		•	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		by the Evaminar	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	J. ,		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	animor. Note the attached	d Office Action of Torri	1 10-102.
<u> </u>			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:  1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents	- k k		
		P C NJ	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		received in this Nation	nal Stage
application from the International Bureau			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	-
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)	nformal Patent Application (F 	PTO-152)

Art Unit: 3627 Page 2

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but prior to a decision on the appeal. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 22, 2004 (Paper Nº 20040422) has been entered.

## **Preliminary Remarks**

- 2. This Office action responds to the amendment and arguments filed by applicant on April 22, 2004 (Paper № 20040422) in reply to the Office action mailed October 22, 2003.
- 3. The amendment of claims 22, 26, and 28 by applicant in Paper  $N^{o}$  20040422 is hereby acknowledged.
- 4. The cancellation of claims 25 and 29-42 by applicant in Paper  $N^{\circ}$  20040422 is hereby acknowledged.

Art Unit: 3627 Page 3

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- 6. Claims 22-24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Imai et al. (US 5,870,467). Note that, in making this rejection, the extensively recited functional language has been deemed merely intended usage of the invention, hence, afforded little patentable weight. See MPEP §2114.

Imai et al. show a data conversion apparatus 100 comprising: a data transmission/receiving section 11; a data format judging section 3; an attribute information obtaining section 4; a user ID storage section storing identification information identifying the user of the data conversion apparatus (a user ID identifying the user of the data conversion apparatus being necessarily, thus inherently, present in order to perform the disclosed "authentication"); a ciphering section 132 for ciphering the attribute information (ciphering being necessarily, thus inherently, present in order to "protect" the data in the manner disclosed); a data format conversion section 5 for adding the

Art Unit: 3627 Page 4

ciphered attribute information and identification information to the audio contents; and, a controller 1, wherein the data transmission/receiving section of Imai et al. includes a data read-out portion 6 and a network interface 102. See, in particular, Figure 11.

Regarding claim 23, the data conversion apparatus of Imai et al. further comprises a data outputting section 6.

Regarding claim 24, the data conversion apparatus of Imai et al. further comprises a recording section 105 and a charging section 104.

Regarding claim 26-28, the recited functional language has been deemed merely intended usage of the invention, hence, afforded little patentable weight. See MPEP §2114.

## Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments filed Apr 22, 2004 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
- 8. Regarding the argument that Imai et al. does not disclose all of the recited functional language recited by applicant's apparatus claims relative to the specific copyright/data protection scheme/format known as "superdistribution" (though "superdistribution" is specifically mentioned by Imai et al.) a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Art Unit: 3627 Page 5

9. Regarding the argument that the data transmission/receiving section of the data conversion apparatus 100 of Imai et al. fails to include a data read-out portion and a network interface, the data transmission/receiving section of Imai et al. indeed includes a data read-out portion 6 and a network interface 102. See, in particular, Figure 11.

- 10. Regarding the argument that the Imai et al. fail to disclose certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., performing a CDDB-type of remote audio CD database lookup to identify a normal, non-super-distribution, audio CD) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- 11. Regarding the argument that the data conversion apparatus 100 of Imai et al. is incapable of reading data out of a disc medium, the data conversion apparatus 100 of Imai et al. is indeed capable of reading data out of a disc medium, and, in the event that any translation issues may possibly be creating confusion, the examiner specifically notes that audio contents of a CD are considered "data in a disc medium."
- 12. Regarding the argument that the data conversion apparatus 100 of Imai et al. is incapable of storing identification information identifying the user of the data conversion apparatus, the

Art Unit: 3627 Page 6

data conversion apparatus 100 of Imai et al. is indeed capable of storing identification information identifying the user of the data conversion apparatus, since a user ID identifying the user of the data conversion apparatus is necessarily, thus inherently, present in order to perform the disclosed "authentication" (authentication being the determination/establishment of identity).

13. Regarding the argument that the data conversion apparatus 100 of Imai et al. is incapable of recording superdistribution format data, the data conversion apparatus 100 of Imai et al. is indeed capable of recording superdistribution format data, as that is one of its intended purposes.

#### Conclusion

- 14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the disclosure.
- 15. Any inquiry concerning this communication, or earlier communications, should be directed to the examiner, **Jerry O'Connor**, whose telephone number is **(703)** 305-1525, and whose facsimile number is **(703)** 746-3976.

The examiner can normally be reached weekdays from 9:30 to 6:00.

Inquiries of a general nature or simply relating to the status of the application should be directed to the receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703) 308-5183.

Art Unit: 3627 Page 7

Official replies to this Office action may be submitted by any *one* of fax, mail, or hand delivery. **Faxed replies are preferred and should be directed to (703) 872-9306** (fax-back auto-reply receipt service provided). Mailed replies should be addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450." Hand delivered replies should be left with the receptionist on the seventh floor of Crystal Park Five, 2451 Crystal Dr, Arlington, VA 22202.

**GJOC** 

July 23, 2004

Gerald J. O'Connor

(7-23-04)

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unit 3627